

XXI

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
FED.
PERIODICAL
REF. ROOM

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

GENERAL NUMBER

Emile Durkheim as Educator

Elmer N. Lear 193

A Study of Religious Motivation and Delinquency

John F. Travers and Russel G. Davis 205

Opinions of Divinity and Law Students on Social Class

Earl Edward Muntz, Jr. 221

Remedial Reading Within a Small Grout Setting

Henry W. Maier 230

Book Review 238

JANUARY 1961

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY
THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED
OF
RHO CHAPTER, PHI DELTA KAPPA
AT
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON SQUARE
NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

Editorial Staff

DAN W. DODSON, *Editor in Chief*

Assistant Editors: JOHN C. PAYNE, ABRAHAM I. KATSH, I. DAVID SATLOW,
ETHEL ALPENFELS

IRVING RATCHICK, *Book Review Editor*

EVELYN F. DODSON, *Business Manager*

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

Board of Trustees

MAURICE MOFFAT, *President*

HERBERT D. HARPER, *Vice-President*

HENRY W. MEISSNER, *Secretary*

I. DAVID SATLOW, *Treasurer*

DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Trustee*

EMANUEL EHRLICH

LEWIS BENTON

SEYMOUR GANG

IRVING RATCHICK

FREDERICK SHAW

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by the Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, New York University, Washington Square, New York 3, N. Y. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$4.25, all others, \$4.40; the price of single copies is 50 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The Publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible of the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

E

Vol

hu
me
co
the
pr
tio
tra
the
It
Du

ed
as
cu
un

Co

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 34

January 1961

No. 5

EMILE DURKHEIM AS EDUCATOR

Elmer N. Lear

The world of professional sociology recently observed the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Emile Durkheim. This commemoration was but the just tribute to a pioneer sociologist, whose contributions were of paramount importance. What is regrettable is the virtual neglect of Durkheim in pedagogical circles. Himself a product of the Ecole Normale Supérieure, Durkheim taught education and social science at Bordeaux and at Paris. Aside from teacher training responsibilities, Durkheim's preoccupation with educational theory is repeatedly manifest in the course of his major writings. It is therefore fitting that we sample some of the educational theories Durkheim developed.

I.

Since antiquity, philosophers have speculated upon the aim of education. In modern times, many thinkers have regarded education as primarily a device for human self-betterment. A sound educational curriculum, calculated to effectuate human improvement, would be universally applicable: Durkheim identifies this school:

"For Kant as for Mill, for Herbert as for Spencer, the object of education would be above all to realize, in each individual, but carrying them to their highest possible point of perfection, the attributes distinctive of the human species in general. They stated as a truism that there is one education and one alone, which, to the exclusion of any other, is suitable for all men indiscriminately, whatever may be the historical and social conditions on which they depend—and it is this abstract and unique ideal that the theorists of education proposed to determine. They assumed that there is *one* human nature, the forms and properties of which are determinable once and for all, and the pedagogical problem consisted of investigating how the educational influence should be exercised on human nature so defined."¹

¹ *Education and Sociology*, The Free Press (Glencoe, Ill.), 1956, p. 115.

On this premise, an educational system is founded *de novo* as an outcome of the inspired cogitations of some brilliant theorist. This would be the educational counterpart of a *creatio ex nihilo*; which, in its unblemished logical perfection, warrants universal adoption;

"One imagines that men of each age organize it voluntarily to realize a determined end; that, if this organization is not everywhere the same, it is because mistakes have been made concerning either the end that it is to pursue or the means of attaining it."²

The French school system constitutes a case par excellence of the necessity of investigating education within a social milieu:

"The French schools interpret and express the French spirit. One can understand nothing of what they are, of the end that they pursue, if one does not know what constitutes our national spirit, what its various elements are, which are those that depend on permanent and profound causes, and which, by contrast, are due to the effect of more or less accidental and transitory factors. . . . Much discussion centers around what place should be assigned to the primary school within the totality of our scholastic organization and within the general life of the society. But the problem is insoluble if one does not know how our scholastic organization was formed whence come its distinctive characteristics, what has determined, in the past, the place which has been given in it to the elementary school. . . ."³

What holds for education in general also holds for moral education specifically. Durkheim rejects the thesis that moral institutions are oriented towards the realization of immutably fixed ends. He declares that this view lacks an empirical basis. Morality is not to be justified transcendently, but rather, to be taken in its societal setting:

"We do not know—and this is a confession of ignorance which would be preferable in our schools to the over-simplified and often puerile explanations with which we too often deceive the curiosity of youth—we know nothing whatsoever either of the historical causes or of the teleological reasons that in fact justify the greater part of our moral institutions. Once one has left abstract discussion where theories of morality too often stop short, one cannot but feel that it is impossible to understand the *why* of the family, marriage, the laws of property, etc, either in their present forms or in the new functions that they are called upon to fulfill, without taking into account the social environment. . . ."⁴

² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

³ *Education and Sociology*, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁴ *Sociology and Philosophy*, p. 74.

Not only the broader philosophy of a school system but also its classroom methodology and procedures mirror the governing values of a given society:

"When society, for example, is oriented in an individualistic direction, all the educational procedures which can have the effect of doing violence to the individual, of ignoring his inner spontaneity, will seem intolerable and will be disapproved. By contrast, when, under pressure of lasting or transitory circumstances, it feels the need of imposing on everyone a more rigorous conformity, everything that can provoke excessive initiative of the intelligence will be proscribed. In fact, every time that the system of educational methods has been profoundly transformed, it has been under the influence of one of those great social currents the effect of which has made itself felt throughout the entire collective life . . ."⁵

There are those who see modern education bursting the parochial limits of a given society by positing ecumenical cultural and educational goals. But in point of fact, Durkheim declares, the educational theorist never has a *carte blanche*:

"Thus, how can the individual pretend to reconstruct, through his own private reflection, what is not a work of individual thought? He is not confronted with a *tabula rasa* on which he can write what he wants, but with existing realities which he cannot create, or destroy, or transform, at will. He can act on them only to the extent that he has learned to understand them, to know their nature and the conditions on which they depend;

"⁶

Even were it to be allowed that some one might spin out an educational system off the top of his head, the spinner would need some sort of mental design. How determine what is a proper design?

"When one wants to determine by dialectics alone what education should be, it is necessary to begin by asking what objective it must have. But what is it that allows us to say that education has certain ends rather than others? . . . It will be said in reply that from all the evidence, its object is the training of children . . . It would be necessary to say of what this training consists, what its direction is, what human needs it satisfies."⁷

The objectives of an educational system are to be found within the matrix of a given society. A society creates an educational system, shaping it after its own likeness. Or, to put it otherwise, an educa-

⁵ *Ed. and Socio., op. cit.*, p. 132.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-7.

tional system can only be understood as a function of a given society. It reflects the spirit of a given society and contributes to the persistence of an organic collectivity.

"There is no man who can make a society have, at a given moment, a system of education other than that which is implied in its structure, just as it is impossible for a living organism to have other organs and other functions than those which are implied in its constitution. . . . Educational practices are not phenomena that are isolated from one another; rather, for a given society, they are bound up in the same system, all the parts of which contribute toward the same end: it is the system of education suitable to this country and to this time. Each people has its own, as it has its own moral, religious, economic system. . . . Indeed, I regard as the prime postulate of all pedagogical speculation that education is an eminently social thing in its origins as in its functions, . . ."⁸

Every society has its distinctive ideal of what the desirable citizen shall be. It expects its educational system to develop that ideal. This is readily apparent to anyone who studies the variation in projected human ideals from society to society and then discovers the congruence of society and education in each instance.

"The man whom education should realize in us is not the man such as nature has made him, but as the society wishes him to be; and it wishes him such as its internal economy calls for. What proves this is the manner in which our conception of man has varied from one society to another. For the ancients also believed in making men of their children, just as we do. If they refused to see their fellow-creature in the stranger, it is precisely because in their eyes the education of the city alone could make beings truly and properly human. Only they conceive humanity in their fashion, which is no longer ours. Every change of any importance in the organization of a society results in a change of the same importance in the idea that man makes of himself."⁹

A hasty recapitulation of the weltanschauungen of historical epochs in Western civilization and their educational correlates is appropriately introduced at this point:

"Education has varied infinitely in time and place. In Athens, they sought to form cultivated souls, informed, subtle, full of measure and harmony, capable of enjoying beauty and the joys of pure speculation; in Rome, they wanted above all for children

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 95, 114.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

to become men of action, devoted to military glory, indifferent to letters and the arts. In the Middle Ages, education was above all Christian; in the Renaissance, it assumes a more lay and literary character; today science tends to assume the place in education formerly occupied by the arts."¹⁰

Pedagogical reflection is likewise responsive to societal needs:

"The Middle Ages had no need of it. It was a period of conformity in which everyone thought and felt in the same way, in which all minds were cast in the same mold. . . . Thus education was impersonal; the master in the medieval schools addressed himself to all pupils collectively, without having the notion of adapting his teaching to the nature of each. At the same time, the immutability of the fundamental beliefs was opposed to any rapid evolution of the educational system. For these two reasons he had less need to be guided by pedagogical thought. But in the Renaissance everything changes: individual personalities emerge from the social mass in which they had, until then, been thoroughly immersed; minds become diversified; at the same time historical development accelerates; a new civilization is formed. To meet all these changes pedagogical reflection arises. . . ."¹¹

II

Having established the contingent character of education, Durkheim is prepared to offer a broad definition:

"Education is the influence exercised by adult generations on those that are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to arouse and to develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and the special milieu for which he is specifically destined."¹²

From this definition, the sovereign importance of the educative process is obvious:

"Spontaneously, man was not inclined to submit to a political authority, to respect a moral discipline, to dedicate himself, to be self-sacrificing. There was nothing in our congenital nature that predisposed us necessarily to become servants of divinities, symbolic emblems of society. . . . It is society itself which, to the degree that it is firmly established, has drawn from within itself those great moral forces in the face of which man has felt his

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 71.

inferiority. Society finds itself, with each new generation, faced with a tabula rasa, very nearly, on which it must build anew. To the egoistic and asocial being that has just been born it must, as rapidly as possible, add another, capable of leading a moral and social life. Such is the work of education. . . . It is not limited to developing the individual organism in the direction indicated by its nature. . . . It creates in man a new being."¹³

Primitive societies—and modern ones, too, in less ritualistic fashion—have consecrated the completion of the formal educational process with the impressive ceremonies of initiation:

"Now, it is a belief universally diffused among all these peoples that the initiate, by the very fact of initiation, has become an entirely new man: he changes his personality, he takes another name, and we know that the name was not then considered as a simple verbal sign, but as an essential element of the person. Initiation was considered as a second birth. The primitive mind conceives of this transformation symbolically, imagining that a spiritual principle, a sort of new soul, has come to be incarnated in the individual. But if we separate from this belief the mythical forms in which it is enveloped, do we not find under the symbol this idea, obscurely glimpsed, that education has had the effect of creating a new being in man? It is the social being."¹⁴

Is the educational process of socializing the individual essentially a subjugation of man's basic nature and a destruction of his innate freedom? By no means. It is obvious that there is an element of constraint in the educative process, but there is also an element of liberation: The liberation consists in the release from the brutish side of our primal natures and our efflorescence into humanized beings:

"Taught by its mother, the young animal learns more quickly how to fly or build its nest; but it learns almost nothing from its parents that it would not have been able to discover through its own individual experience. . . . By contrast, among men the aptitudes of every kind that social life presupposes are much too complex to be able to be contained, somehow, in our tissues, to take the form of organic predispositions. It follows that they cannot be transmitted from one generation to another by way of heredity. It is through education that the transmission is effected."¹⁵

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

"Thus the antagonism that has too often been admitted between society and individual corresponds to nothing in the facts. Indeed, far from these two terms being in opposition and being able to develop only each at the expense of the other, they imply each other. The individual, in willing society, wills himself. The individual that it exerts on him, notably through education, does not at all have as its object and its effect to repress him, to diminish him, to denature him, but, on the contrary, to make him grow and to make of him a truly human being. No doubt, he can grow thus only by making an effort. But this is precisely because this power to put forth voluntary effort is one of the most essential characteristics of man."¹⁶

"Liberty and authority have sometimes been opposed, as if these two factors of education contradicted and limited each other. But this opposition is factitious. In reality, these two terms imply, rather than exclude, each other. Liberty is the daughter of authority properly understood. For to be free is not to do what one pleases; it is to be master of oneself, it is to know how to act with reason and to do one's duty. Now, it is precisely to endow the child with this self-mastery that the authority of the teacher should be employed."¹⁷

Thus we find man to be *homo duplex*, with education assigned the delicate and challenging role of developing a proper balance between the elements of this two-fold nature:

"In each of us, it may be said, there exist two beings which, while inseparable except by abstraction, remain distinct. One is made up of all the mental states that apply only to ourselves and to the events of our personal lives: this is what might be called the individual being. The other is a system of ideas, sentiments and practices which express in us, not our personality, but the group or different groups of which we are part: these are religious beliefs, moral beliefs and practices, national or professional traditions, collective opinions of every kind. Their totality forms the social being. To constitute this being in each of us is the end of education."¹⁸

III

Society's concern in embodying its ideal through education in the individual human extends beyond the generic social type. Wherever

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

a society has developed in the direction of specialized functions and division of labor, it must make provision for the formation and training of sub-types:

"Is the society formed of castes? Education varies from one caste to another: that of the patricians was not that of the plebians, that of the Brahman was not that of the Sudra. Similarly, in the Middle Ages, what a difference between the culture the young page received, instructed in all the arts of chivalry, and that of the villein, who learned in his parish school a smattering of arithmetic, song and grammar! Even today, do we not see education vary with social class or even with locality. Each occupation indeed, constitutes a milieu *sui generis* which requires particular aptitudes and specialized knowledge, in which certain ideas, certain practices, certain modes of viewing things, prevail. . . ." ¹⁹

In our day, the proliferation of specialized roles in society has proceeded to the point where there is a danger of mutual incomprehensibility:

"When, under pressure of increased competition, the division of labor increases when the specialization of each worker is at the same time more marked and more advanced, the universe of discourse of common education will necessarily be limited and therefore, the characteristics of the human type will also become limited. Formerly, literary culture had been considered as an essential element of all human culture; and now we are approaching a time when it will itself no longer, perhaps, be more than a specialty. . . ." ²⁰

The fragmentation of life is reflected in the excessive departmentalization of the subject matter constituting the curriculum of the French lycee:

"By what miracle could unity result from this diversity? How would these courses be able to be reconciled with one another, to be completed in such a way as to form a whole, if those who give them do not have the feeling of this whole and of the manner in which each must cooperate in it. Although we may not at present be in a position to define the end of secondary education . . . still, we can say that at the lycee it is not a matter of making either a mathematician, or a man of letters, or a natural-

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

ist, or an historian, but of shaping a mind by means of letters, history, mathematics, etc. But how will each teacher be able to discharge his function . . . if he does not know what his work is, how his collaborators cooperate in it with him, in such a way that his efforts fit into theirs?"²¹

Intensive training in one academic area turns out a highly proficient specialist, but not necessarily competent to deal with human issues outside his professional pale. This is due to the erroneousness of the notion that by developing mental faculties, training is transferable from one area to another:

"This is because it is not true that one is qualified to reflect on a given order of facts merely because one has the occasion to exercise his reflection in a different order of phenomena. Many are the great scientists who have made outstanding contributions to their science, but who, however, with respect to everything outside their specialty, are as children. . . . The reason for this is that the prejudices which hinder the play of reflection differ according to the order of things to which they apply; it can be, then, that the same mind may be free on one point, while on another it remains in servitude. . . ."²²

Is the development of the whole man, the integrated, well-adjusted personality the solution? It is clear that Durkheim, who had devoted much thought to the problems of industrialized urban society, would accept no panaceas. He raises grave doubts concerning the preferability of a generalized over a specialized education.

"Why should there be more dignity in being complete and mediocre, rather than in living a more specialized, but more intense life, particularly if it is thus possible for us to find what we have lost in this specialization, through our association with other beings who have what we lack and who complete us. . . . Among lower peoples, the proper duty of man is to resemble his companions, to realize in himself all the traits of the collective type which are then confounded, much more than today, with the human type. But in more advanced societies, his nature is, in large part, to be an organ of society, and his proper duty, consequently, is to play his role as an organ."

"We can then say that, in higher societies, our duty is not to spread our activity over a large surface, but to concentrate and specialize it. We must contract our horizon, choose a definite

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 137-138.

task and immerse ourselves in it completely, instead of trying to make ourselves a sort of creative masterpiece. . . . Our conclusion is not that it is good to press specialization as far as possible, but as far as necessary. As for the part that is to be played by these two opposing necessities, that is determined by experience and cannot be calculated a priori. . . ." ²³

IV

Durkheim is also skeptical about some of the proposed programs of worker education. While conceding that the monotonous repetition of discrete manual movements can have a debasing effect upon the human personality, he refuses to accept cultural dilettantism as the answer:

"As a remedy, it has sometimes been proposed that, in addition to their technical and special instruction, workers be given a general education. But, suppose that we can thus relieve some of the bad effects attributed to the division of labor; that is not a means of preventing them. . . . No doubt, it is good for the worker to be interested in art, literature, etc., but it is none the less bad that he should be treated as a machine all day. . . . If a person has grown accustomed to vast horizons, total views, broad generalities, he cannot be confined, without impatience, within the strict limits of a special task. Such a remedy would make specialization inoffensive by making it intolerable, and, consequently, more or less impossible." ²⁴

From this one might conclude that Durkheim is inconsistent in his advocacy, wavering between the humanistic values of an integrative education and the practical advantages of specific competencies. Yet his position is not really a case of fence-straddling. He declares that the division of labor need not eventuate in the baleful consequences so appalling to sensitive commentators on our contemporary civilization:

". . . contrary to what has been said, the division of labor does not produce these consequences because of a necessity of its own nature, but only in exceptional and abnormal circumstances. . . . It is necessary and it is sufficient for it to be itself, for nothing to come from without to denature it. For, normally, the role of each special function does not require that

²³ *On The Division of Labor in Society*, Macmillan Co. (New York), 1933. p. 403, 401.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

the individual close himself in, but that he keep himself in constant relations with neighboring functions, take conscience of their needs, of the changes which they undergo, etc. The division of labor presumes that the worker, far from being hemmed in by his task, does not lose sight of his collaborators, that he acts upon them, and reacts to them. He is, then, not a machine who repeats his movements without knowing their meaning, but he knows that they tend, in some way, towards an end that he conceives more or less distinctly. He feels that he is serving something. For that, he need not embrace vast portions of the social horizon; it is sufficient that he perceive enough of it to understand that his actions have an aim beyond themselves. . . ."²⁵

Durkheim's compromise may fail to satisfy many of his readers. Perhaps there is no way out in terms of the organization of industry as he knew it. However, there is a new age dawning—that of automation, whose full significance is as yet incalculable.

V

What then shall be the ideal informing contemporary man? Unlike French society of the seventeenth century, our age is totally deficient in intellectual and moral security:

"The profound transformations which contemporary societies have undergone, or which they are in process of undergoing, necessitate corresponding transformations in the national education. But although we may be well aware that changes are necessary, we do not know what they should be. Whatever may be the private convictions of individuals or factions, public opinion remains undecided and anxious. . . . It is no longer a matter of putting verified ideas into practice, but of finding ideas to guide us. . . ."²⁶

The confusion and disquietude, the anomie of our era, has affected our professional teachers. How shall we conceive of the good teacher?

"He . . . is the agent of a great moral person who surpasses him: it is society. Just as the priest is the interpreter of his god, the teacher is the interpreter of the great moral ideas of his time and of his country. Let him be attached to these ideas, let him feel all their grandeur, and the authority which is in them, and of which he is aware, cannot fail to be communicated

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 372-373.

²⁶ *Ed. and Socio.*, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

to his person and to everything that emanates from him. Into an authority which flows from such an impersonal source there could enter no pride, no vanity, no pedantry. It is made up entirely of the respect which he has for his functions and, if one may say so, for his office. It is this respect which, through word and gesture, passes from him to the child."²⁷

Contrast now the idealized image with the many perplexed, demoralized, tough-minded teachers of today—teachers who have abandoned a "calling" for a job. This body of professionals is neither clear about its own role in society or the values espoused by society itself:

"On the one hand, the old enthusiasm for classical letters, the faith that they inspired, are irremediably shaken. . . . But, on the other hand, no new faith has yet come to replace that which has disappeared. The result is that the teacher often asks himself, uneasily, what end he is serving and where his efforts tend; he does not see clearly how his functions are related to the vital functions of society. Hence comes a certain tendency to scepticism, a sort of disenchantment, a veritable moral uneasiness, in a word, which cannot develop without danger. A teaching body without pedagogical faith is a body without a soul. . . ."²⁸

Can sociology lead us out of this impasse? Durkheim would say yes—and emphatically:

"I do not believe that I am following a mere prejudice or yielding to an immoderate love for a science which I have cultivated all my life in saying that never was a sociological approach more necessary for the educator. It is not because sociology can give us ready-made procedures which we need only use. Are there, in any case, any of this sort? But it can do more and it can do better. It can give us what we need more urgently; I mean to say a body of guiding ideas that may be the core of our practice and that sustain it, that give a meaning to our action, and that attach us to it; which is the necessary condition for this action to be fruitful."²⁹

Query whether in an age of total anomie, marked, according to Sorokin, by the "disintegration of sensate culture and society," sociology can give us "a body of guiding ideas."

Elmer N. Lear is Associate Professor of Education at Wagner College, Grymes Hill, Staten Island, New York.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

A STUDY OF RELIGIOUS MOTIVATION AND DELINQUENCY

John F. Travers and Russell G. Davis

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile Delinquency is a national problem; and that problem is growing. In 1948, three hundred thousand delinquents appeared before the courts; in 1955, the number was half a million; and the estimated number for 1960 is one million. In the seven years from 1948 to 1955, the number of juvenile delinquents increased 66% whereas the significant population, (ten to seventeen year olds) increased only 16%. With a census prediction that by 1965, the United States will have 50% more boys and girls in the ten to seventeen year group than in 1955, the figures predicted for juvenile delinquency in the mid-1960's are staggering. And the figures cited represent only a fraction of the delinquent population that has been apprehended and brought into court. The number of covert delinquents is, and presumably will be, a great deal larger.

Apart from *ad hoc* programs developed by courts, police, and private agencies to effect practical control of delinquency, a great deal of basic research has been conducted to determine possible causes and solutions to the problem. Results suggest the obvious, i.e. that there is no one cause and no one cure of the problem. Delinquency breeds in an interaction of privations: Economic, Moral, Familial, Social, Intellectual, Physical, Spiritual, and the like. The family and home, the church and school, the neighborhood and community, the individual's own moral and intellectual traits all show the failure of society that is delinquency.

No one of the complex of causes or possible cures has been more inadequately investigated than that of religion and church influence on the delinquent. Findings are in complete conflict and range from those investigators who view religion as a cure to those who seem to view it as a cause. This is particularly true of the Catholic religion. Research frequently indicates that delinquency is a severe problem in areas where the population is heavily Catholic. Catholics have argued that this data merely demonstrates that a higher proportion of Catholics live in the less favored parts of a city where delinquency spawns. This does not minimize the problem for Catholics, but it does indicate that Catholics are an obvious group for an analysis of delinquency and religion.

* Part II will appear in a subsequent issue.

In view of the high degree of conflict in the findings with respect to religion and juvenile delinquency, a more exact examination was indicated.

LOGIC OF THE INVESTIGATION

Definitions

As used in this study, the term "delinquent" does not entail a strictly legal connotation since this does not encompass all behavior that may be classified as delinquent. For the purposes of this study, delinquency refers to those adjudicated, and those identified as behavior problems by parents, schools, or police.

"Religion" refers to the Roman Catholic faith. It does not refer to such surface features as attendance at Mass, etc., but rather to the intensity of a boy's commitment to Catholicism as indicated on a questionnaire constructed solely for this purpose.

In addition to the religious motive, although this was the principal area of investigation, an attempt was made to investigate other factors to which the delinquent responds. These forces are: 1. Awareness of Civil Law; 2. Family Loyalty; 3. Peer Group Loyalty; 4. Community Loyalty; 5. Practical Consequences of the Delinquent Act. These are the forces that were studied in this investigation.

Subjects Studied

The sample had the following characteristics: 1. Male; 2. White; 3. Age: ten to seventeen years; 4. Northeastern urban area; 5. Catholic. Total number: two hundred and twenty-three boys of which one hundred and twenty were non-delinquents and one hundred and three were delinquents.

The final sample was obtained from many clusters. The breakdown is as follows:

Non-Delinquent

1. Public school boys attending Christian Doctrine classes in a large Greater Boston parish. Sixty cases.
2. A Catholic home for boys whose parents are separated for any reason. This institution does not accept problem boys. Sixty cases.

Delinquent

1. Detention school of a Youth Service Board. Thirty-two cases.
2. A Guidance Center in the Boston area. Thirty-two cases.
3. Juvenile Division attached to a District Court. Thirty-five cases.
4. A training school attached to a Juvenile Court. Four cases. (The small number is because only four of twenty boys were Catholic)

In each case, the organization or institution involved requested that its name be withheld.

MEASUREMENT

To probe more deeply into the actual operation of religion within the Catholic subject, the creation of an appropriate instrument was necessary. Because of the lack of a desirable instrument which would evaluate and measure the relationship between religion and delinquency, a questionnaire consisting of multiple choice items was devised. The chief purpose of the questionnaire was to determine what motivated the boy in various situations. Was he responding to the idea of not wanting to offend God; was he afraid of being sent to reform school; or was he afraid of shaming his family? Each question had multiple responses, representing religion, civil authority, family loyalty, peer group loyalty, community loyalty and practical consequences of the act. It was hoped that these responses would show the pattern of thought representing the driving force behind a boy's behavior. For example, the first case of the questionnaire presented the problem of several boys attempting to persuade one other boy to go with them to steal clothes from a store. The situation is presented as follows:

Al thought if they told him what they had planned, Ed might stick with them. He said: "Next, we're going to the stores in town, and swipe clothes. Then, we'll bring them back here and sell them to people cheap."

Ed thinks, "This is tricky, but I could sure use the money."

What else should Ed think about?

Pick One

- a. We'd be doing poor people a favor by getting them clothes cheap
- b. This is a serious sin
- c. This could mean reform school
- d. We'd never get away with it because people would know the clothes were stolen
- e. I could use the money to buy a jacket like the rest of the gang

Each of the responses shows a pattern of thought that represents the driving force behind a boy's behavior, i.e. religion, community well-being, fear of civil authority, etc.

The place and function of religion in the dynamics of behavior can not be ascertained by using mere surface features, e.g., baptized a Catholic, attended Mass while in reform school, etc. Hence, the development of an instrument was necessary that not only evaluated the force of religion in determining behavior but also compared the motivating force of religion with the concepts of civil authority, family

loyalty, group loyalty, community loyalty, and practical consequences of the act.

The first tryout of the questionnaire was administered to thirty-four Catholic boys who had been identified as behavior problems by their teachers. This tryout was considered successful in that it confirmed the basic assumption of the study—boys in trouble are not as religiously oriented as those who might be considered trouble-free. This group chose the responses designated practical and civil, as frequently as they chose the religious response.

An item analysis was done and many of the responses were revised to clarify meaning and to rephrase them in a unilateral manner. The questionnaire was now given to twenty-one Catholic boys as a final tryout. These boys were selected on the basis of their being as free from delinquent tendencies as possible. This sample contained a high proportion of altar boys and parochial school boys noted by their teachers as being outstanding. In each case, the boys showed a strong inclination to select items containing the religious concept. The questionnaire appeared to discriminate between delinquents and non-delinquents on the basis of religious response.

The reliability coefficient was determined by the test-retest method. Thirty-one boys were retested, of which nineteen were non-delinquent, and twelve were delinquent. The reliability coefficient was reported as .63.

The next step was to determine the statistical treatment that would provide the most information obtainable from the data. In order to place individual scores in high-low categories, e.g., religion, civil, etc., the median was used. Once the scores were able to be classified according to high and low scores, tests to ascertain differences and relationships were selected. To determine significant differences between delinquents and non-delinquents, the chi square test was used. To determine relationship, the coefficient of contingency was used since it utilized the chi square value.

After the questionnaire had been administered to all the boys involved in the study, the results were studied to determine the differences between delinquents and non-delinquents. First, the religious response scores were analyzed.

Of the fifty-eight questions in the test, forty-seven of them contained a religious response. Any item that mentioned God, Heaven, Hell, etc., was categorized as a religious response.

Respondents were assigned as "High" Religion, "Low" Religion, depending on whether or not their scores on religious responses were above or below the median score for the entire group. The frequency distribution, mean, and median of the religious scores is given in Table One.

TABLE I

Frequency Distribution and Summary Statistics of
Religious Scores for Delinquents
and Non-Delinquents

<i>Score Intervals</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>cf</i>
41 - 43	2	223
38 - 40	1	221
35 - 37	6	220
32 - 34	10	214
29 - 31	11	204
26 - 28	9	193
23 - 25	16	184
20 - 22	22	168
17 - 19	24	146
14 - 16	26	122
11 - 13	36	96
8 - 10	27	60
5 - 7	29	33
2 - 4	4	4

N=223

Mdn.=15.29

X=16.79

The score distribution showed considerable positive skew. The range was from 3 to 42. The mean was 16.79 and the median 15.29. To dichotomize the scores into high and low religious categories, scores sixteen and below were considered Low Religion; seventeen and above were considered High Religion. Scores were then classified into High-Low Religion Cells by Delinquent and Non-Delinquent.

With each individual classified High and Low on the religious score yielded by the questionnaire, and with each individual also classifiable on the basis of biographical data as high or low delinquent actually "delinquent" and "non-delinquent") a statistical test could then be run which would show whether delinquents differed significantly on their religious responses in the questionnaire. This test is the heart of the research since the basic hypothesis is that delinquents would respond differently from non-delinquents to questions which assessed the strength of religious motivations underlying actions. In another sense, this first run was also a validation of the test instrument itself. If responses by delinquents were different from responses by non-delinquents, and if, of course, the difference was in the direction expected, i.e., non-delinquents showed more responses reflecting religious motivations, then the test might be presumed valid in that it did distinguish delinquents from non-delinquents.

The result of this test on the total sample of 223 classified in a 2x2 array is shown in Table Two. For the initial run, the most stringent, non parametric test was used, i.e., chi square with one degree of freedom. If anything, this test would tend to underestimate the significance of the difference.

TABLE 2
Delinquents and Non-Delinquents Classified
by High and Low Religious Response

<i>Scores</i>	<i>Delinquent</i>	<i>Non-Delinquent</i>	<i>Total</i>
High Religion 17 and above	33 (48.93)	73 (57.07)	106
Low Religion 16 and below	70 (54.07)	47 (62.93)	117
Total	103	120	223
	$X^2=18.36$		
	$C=.28$		

With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of 18.36 is significant beyond the one per cent level. Therefore, as far as religious motivation underlying acts and inclinations in the questionnaire is concerned, an extremely significant difference is apparent between delinquents and non-delinquents.

To determine if the use of the median was acceptable in dividing scores into high-low categories, the median test was applied. As Siegel states:

More precisely, the median test will give information as to whether it is likely that two independent groups (not necessarily of the same size) have been drawn from populations with the same median.¹

If the results of the median test were insignificant, it would indicate that the delinquents and non-delinquents used in this study were two groups from populations with the same median on religious response. Therefore, the median would not distinguish high from low, since we would expect about half of each group's scores to be above the combined median and about half to be below.² The results of the median test are reported in Table Three.

¹ Sidney Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), p. 111.

² Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, p. 111.

TABLE 3
Median Test—Combined Religious Scores
of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents

<i>Scores</i>	<i>Delinquent</i>	<i>Non-Delinquent</i>	<i>Total</i>
Scores Above	36	76	112
Combined Median			
Scores Below	67	44	111
Combined Median	—	—	—
Total	103	120	223
	$X^2=16.59$		

The X^2 (chi square) value of 16.59 is significant beyond the one percent level and closely approximates the chi square value of 18.36. Therefore, the use of the median to divide religious scores into high-low categories is acceptable.

Since the chi square value is significant, the hypothesis of no difference between delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to religious motivation is rejected. A relationship between religious response and delinquency does appear. The contingency coefficient of .28 shows this relationship. In a 2x2 table, the maximum value of the contingency coefficient is .71. The C of .28 reflects a significant relationship. It is however, far short of the perfect maximum which would be .71. Obviously, all non-delinquents do not possess the same degree of religious motivation. Some fall on the low end of the distribution. Neither are all delinquent boys low on religion. A C of .28 reflects this less than perfect but still significant relationship.

The hypothesis being tested in this analysis was that youngsters with a high degree of religious intensity will be lower on juvenile delinquency than non-delinquents. This hypothesis is confirmed by the above results.

Consequently, the force of religion in the dynamics of behavior, rather than being cast aside, must be increasingly emphasized in an age of violence and uncertainty.

The discussion of the place of religion in the life of the delinquent highlights the uses to which religion may be put. Religion should be considered a potent factor in both prevention and treatment of delinquency. It becomes the duty of the religious institution to seek out actively all members entrusted to its care and make religion a real, vital influence in their lives. Hence, religious leaders should be specifically trained to diagnose potential delinquents and offer them a religious experience that will deter them from delinquency and crime. The ability of the leader to bring effective religious help to the potential or active delinquent depends upon the personal, social, and

emotional qualifications of such a person. This varies with each individual. Nevertheless, the curriculum of religious training schools should offer courses in those areas preparing future religious workers for social work in the community. Training should be offered as minimum requirements in fields such as Applied Psychology, Pedagogy, and Social Case Work with strong community orientation.³

Those directly concerned with the training of leaders should investigate also the personal characteristics of clergy who operate most successfully in this field. As Kvaraceus points out:

Job descriptions of effective operators in the field need to be made; the traits, knowledge, and skills required on the job need to be analyzed; and techniques for selecting trainees who give the most promise of carrying out (not just learning) pastoral duties need to be developed. A comprehensive job analysis of the most effective clergy in the field would also constitute the first step toward improving the curriculum in theological schools.⁴

Graduation and assignment should not terminate the religious instructor's education. Follow-up work in specific areas such as Sociology, Juvenile Delinquency, and Criminology, should be carried on in evening school and summer sessions of universities. Thus, he will be familiar with many and varied techniques in his understanding and approach to the delinquent.

Much the same holds true for the lay public who attempts to aid the delinquent. State and local authorities should stimulate the in-service training of personnel employed in the prevention and control of delinquency. Also, the enlargement and improvement of the education and training facilities for those who are preparing to be social workers, psychologists, counselors, etc. should be encouraged. The stages of preparatory education and in-service training should include specific work in the religion of the student. Thus, the Catholic counselor, or Catholic social worker, should be given the opportunity to avail himself of courses that refresh the fundamentals of his faith and suggest possibilities of closer contact with church facilities.

Results bear witness to the statement of Kalmer and Weir that there is no cure for crime that neglects religious education and religious principles.⁵ And yet, few institutions engaged in the reha-

³ William Kvaraceus, *The Community and the Delinquent* (New York: The World Book Co., 1954), p. 394.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 394.

⁵ Leo Kalmer and Elegius Weir, *Crime and Religion* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1936), p. XV.

bilitation of delinquents actually consider religion as part of their treatment program, or use the services of the trained religious for counselling. Without religious training and experience, can a delinquent be truly rehabilitated? It appears doubtful. Only religious experience seems to lead to a recognition of the basic purpose of life and the fundamental difference between right and wrong.

PART II

In Part One of this study, the initial analysis investigated the over-all difference in religious response between delinquents and non-delinquents and was found to be significant beyond the one-percent level. Delinquents were much less oriented toward religion than their delinquent-free counterparts. Evidence was established that religious motives are significantly different in the lives of the two classes of boys.

Once the religious difference between delinquents and non-delinquents had been established, attention was directed to the delinquents in order to discover what factors might be contributing to the religious difference between them and the non-delinquents. The median of the delinquents' religious scores was used to separate these boys into High Religion-Low Religion. The first influence to be studied was that of age. For purposes of analysis, the boys were separated into two age groups, ten to thirteen, and fourteen to seventeen. Neither Chi square nor the contingency coefficient was significant. Age does not seem to influence the attitude of the delinquent toward religion.

The next factor studied was that of school-retardation. Sixty-two of the boys were retarded. There was no significant difference in this respect between those retarded in school and those not retarded.

A significant difference was reported between delinquents living at home and those in an institution. More institutionalized boys chose the religious response than those living at home. These results were anticipated since thirty-two of the boys were confined to a Catholic institution.

There was no significant difference between the boys when they were classified by seriousness of offense. (Serious offenses were based on the F.B.I.'s Classification of Offenses)

Also, there was no significant difference when the boys were classified by grade level. This was expected since the age factor had not been significant.

The last aspect to be analyzed was a comparison between boys who came from homes where mothers worked and boys who came from homes where mothers did not work. There was *no* significant difference. As an added step, both delinquents and non-delinquents were

classified by working mothers. It was found that there was no significant difference between the groups, in fact, *more* mothers of non-delinquents worked than would be expected. This seems to indicate that in the case of many delinquents, the fact of the mother working may not be important, given the added presence of such intangibles as love for the child, warmth of family feeling, and closeness between mother and child.

A further attempt was made to discover what religious concepts or symbols might or might not be significant. These were Heaven-Hell, God, Sin, and Priest. Again, the delinquents were much lower in their selection of these items. It seems as if anything of a religious nature was less meaningful among delinquents than non-delinquents.

Although the major analysis was carried out in the religious area, the opportunity to analyze differences between delinquents and non-delinquents on other motivations was present because the questionnaire contained these other concepts of family, civil, group, community, and practical consequences of the act.

There was no significant difference between delinquents and non-delinquents in their feelings toward the community in which they reside.

Neither was there any significant difference between the two classes of boys as far as fearing the consequences of their act in a practical manner, e.g. what will happen if I'm caught.

THE CONCEPT OF CIVIL AUTHORITY

Do these two classes of boys differ in their attitude toward civil authority? The questionnaire was designed to reveal differences between the boys in response to motives of civil obedience. It was hypothesized that a difference would be revealed in response to items that contained such symbols as police, courts, reform schools, etc. Examples of this would be: "We won't do this because it could mean reform school," or, "Stealing can send you to prison."

It was expected that delinquent boys would be more conscious of law and civil machinery than would non-delinquents. Boys engaged in deviate acts have had more occasion to feel the weight of civil authority than have non-delinquents. The delinquent might go on and flaunt civil authority even though he is actually more aware of the strength of it than the non-delinquent who has had no experience with law and the courts. Table Four reports the frequency distribution, mean and median of the Civil Scores.

The chi square value of 4.87 is significant at the five percent level, with C illustrating the resultant relationship. While the difference is

significant, nevertheless, it is not quite so large as was anticipated. It is seen that over one-half of the delinquent boys were classified as high, while only a little more than one-third of the non-delinquents received this same classification.

The hypothesis that youngsters who are oriented toward civil law and authority are low on juvenile delinquency is rejected. But, the result should be interpreted with caution.

TABLE 4
Frequency Distribution and Summary Statistics
of Civil Scores

<i>Score Intervals</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>cf</i>
24 - 25	4	223
22 - 23	6	219
20 - 21	30	213
18 - 19	26	183
16 - 17	29	157
14 - 15	46	128
12 - 13	24	82
10 - 11	26	58
8 - 9	11	32
6 - 7	14	21
4 - 5	5	7
2 - 3	2	2

$N=223$

$Mdn.=14.78$

$X=14.62$

The median score of 14.62 was used to separate the high and low categories. Of the fifty-eight questions, fifty-two contained responses to civil authority. Table Five indicates the chi square and contingency coefficient values for this classification.

TABLE 5
Delinquents and Non-Delinquents Classified by
High and Low Response to the Civil Concept

<i>Scores</i>	<i>Delinquent</i>	<i>Non-Delinquent</i>	<i>Total</i>
High (16 and above)	52 (43.88)	43 (51.12)	95
Low (15 and below)	51 (59.12)	77 (68.88)	128

$X^2=4.87$

$C=.141$

Although delinquents are more conscious of civil law and authority, there certainly is no guarantee that this is a positive orientation. In fact, it would be safe to assert that this orientation is strictly negative. Delinquent boys are acutely conscious of this concept, but mainly to avoid, evade, and disregard it. The phrasing of the hypothesis is correct, but its interpretation and understanding is liable to cause confusion in this case.

Summarizing, mere recognition of the existence of civil law and authority is not sufficient to be considered a deterrent to delinquency.

THE FAMILY CONCEPT

An attempt to establish the feelings of delinquents and non-delinquents toward family loyalty was next undertaken. Research indicates that family cohesiveness is an important, if not the most important element in a boy's life. On the parents' part, this means adequate supervision, fair discipline and creation of an atmosphere in which the child feels wanted.

If these are lacking, the normal reaction of a boy is to look elsewhere for this security. Too often, he thinks he has found it in street corner gangs, pool rooms, and penny arcades. This becomes the only place where he is truly understood, and takes the place of the home.

The questionnaire undertook to determine family feelings as far as possible. Would the delinquent select the father-mother image rather than the priest or teacher? Would he avoid trouble in order not to worry his parents? Of the fifty-eight questions, twenty-nine involved this response.

An example of this would be, "I wouldn't want to hurt my folks", or "How could I explain this money to my father?"

The study sought to assess whether delinquents tend to this response more than non-delinquents. The hypothesis is that youngsters who have a high regard for family integrity are low on juvenile delinquency.

Table Six illustrates the frequency distribution of Family Scores and gives the mean and median.

Classification was carried out by using the median as the High-Low indicator.

Table Seven reports chi square and the contingency coefficient.

The chi square value of 16.21 is significant beyond the one percent level, and C of .26 indicates a high degree of relationship. The direction of this difference is amazing. Far more delinquents were classified as being high on family orientation than were non-delinquents.

How is this to be interpreted? Does this in any way refute other

TABLE 6
Frequency Distribution and Summary Statistics
of Family Scores

<i>Score Intervals</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>cf</i>
15	6	223
14	5	217
13	4	212
12	13	208
11	17	195
10	22	178
9	19	156
8	25	137
7	36	112
6	21	76
5	21	55
4	20	34
3	10	14
2	3	4
1	1	1

$N=223$

$Mdn.=7.49$

$X=7.83$

research findings? The answers to these questions lie in a consideration of what is and what should be.

Research to date has discovered that in the background of the great majority of these boys, there is a history of poor home conditions. This does *not* indicate, however, that the delinquent boy does not wish he had parents to whom he could turn. On the contrary, this

TABLE 7
Delinquents and Non-Delinquents Classified by
High and Low Response to the Family Concept

<i>Scores</i>	<i>Delinquent</i>	<i>Non-Delinquent</i>	<i>Total</i>
High (9 and above)	52 (37.56)	30 (44.44)	82
Low (8 and below)	51 (65.44)	90 (75.56)	141
Total	103	120	223

$X^2=16.21$

$C=.26$

probably represents an acute sense of longing on the part of such a boy. When faced with a question on whom he would like to depend, it is then that this suppressed desire becomes apparent.

This interesting conclusion is very important in our thinking about delinquency. Too frequently, the tendency is to shrug off such questions by stating that this type of boy does not care about his family anyway. Exactly the opposite is true. He cares intensely but never has been given the chance to express his feelings. Therefore, a distinction must be made between what a boy's background actually is, and what he himself would like it to be.

Most research has overlooked this desire of the delinquent for a cohesive family life.

THE GROUP CONCEPT

The last factor to be considered was that of allegiance to the peer group. Do delinquents and non-delinquents differ significantly in loyalty to their peers? The questionnaire contained seventeen questions that reflected group loyalty. Loyalty to group over others was seen when a boy selected such items as "I'll go along with them because they're my buddies," or, "I can't let my pals down when the going gets tough." The subject chose this type of response over offense against God, disappointing parents, etc.

Table Eight shows the frequency distribution of Group scores, and gives the mean and the median. It is interesting to note that although seventeen items contained the group concept, the highest number selected by any boy was eight. This would imply that the non-delinquent portion of the sample was not responding to the group notion.

TABLE 8
Frequency Distribution and Summary Statistics of
Group Scores

<i>Score Intervals</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>cf</i>
8	7	23
7	15	216
6	15	201
5	31	186
4	42	155
3	51	113
2	41	62
1	17	21
0	4	4

N=223

Mdn.=3.47

X=3.70

The median score of 3.47 separated the boys into high-low categories. Table Nine reports chi square and the contingency coefficient.

TABLE 9

Delinquents and Non-Delinquents Classified by High and Low Response to the Group Concept

Score	Delinquents	Non-Delinquents	Total
High (5 and above)	40 (30.02)	25 (34.98)	65
Low (4 and below)	63 (72.98)	95 (85.02)	158
Total	103	120	223

$X^2=8.67$
 $C=.19$

The chi square value of 8.67 is significant beyond the one percent level. A C of .19 indicates a reasonable degree of relationship. Many more delinquents than non-delinquents were classified as high on peer group loyalty. This was anticipated. The hypothesis that delinquents and non-delinquents do not differ in their loyalty to the peer group is rejected.

Facing rejection at home, and in the school, where else can these boys turn but to the group or gang? What is even more important, they are attracted to companions who are in a condition similar to their own. Delinquent boys tend to delinquent groups. They are not content with non-delinquent friends. This does not mean that gang involvement caused delinquency, but such association encourages delinquency. By the time of gang involvement, most of these boys would be considered confirmed delinquents. Consider the average age at the onset of initial deviate acts: 8.3 years. Gang age starts three to four years later.

The important point for consideration is that gang loyalty frequently leads to more serious trouble, and is often difficult to channel into new directions. The bonds of loyalty are stronger here than any that resulted from contact with society. It is not only a matter of establishing new contacts and interests within a socially acceptable framework, but also the problem of completely severing gang ties.

CONCLUSION

This study attempted to assess the motivation of delinquent Catholic boys. The first step was a thorough examination of the boy's religious outlook. This could not be done by an investigation of ex-

terior features alone. It should be clear to all researchers in this area by now that institutionalized boys must attend the religious services of their faith. For this reason, two and one-half years were spent in an endeavor to construct an instrument which would evaluate religious feeling.

Delinquents and non-delinquents showed a significant difference in religious response. Among the non-religious responses, those designated as Civil, Family, and Group, showed differences among the boys. In each case, the delinquent is showed a greater tendency to respond to these notions than did the non-delinquents.

These findings have particular significance for education. What can denominational schools do to instill the principles of their faith in this type of youth? The first step is early identification of the potential delinquent. It is now generally agreed that the first signs of delinquency are present as early as eight years of age. Teachers in these schools are in an excellent position to bring the positive effects of their faith to bear in cases where it is lacking, or where a reinforcement of faith is necessary to offset some negative influence.

For its part, public education has a two-fold obligation. Identification is as basic to the public school as to the parochial school. In the light of this study, once the school has identified the delinquent, it then becomes the duty of the school to refer the particular case to those responsible for the boy's religious welfare for aid which the public school cannot furnish. In this way, the school fulfills its obligation and at the same time, maintains its proper place in the American scheme of separate Church and State.

Dr. John F. Travers formerly taught for many years in a high delinquency area in Boston and at present is a member of the faculty of the Boston College School of Education.

Dr. Russell G. Davis is the former Director of the Boston College Office of Educational Research and is presently Chief of Research and Statistics for ICA in Nicaragua.

OPINIONS OF DIVINITY AND LAW STUDENTS ON SOCIAL CLASS

Earl Edward Muntz, Jr., Duke University

INTRODUCTION

How do well-educated people evaluate the different social classes? Are there any significant differences in opinions about social class among these individuals depending on the type of studies that they have chosen to pursue? This survey probes this problem by comparing the opinions of law students with those of divinity students. It is plausible to hypothesize that there are differences between these two types of students in regard to their evaluation of social classes.

Other important inquiries that this survey attempts to answer are: Do students give more favorable ratings to upper classes than they give to the lower classes on characteristics that are not part of the definition of social class? How much agreement do students manifest in rating the different social classes? For example, do all students rate the lower lower class as "low" in intelligence, or is there a wide range of disagreement as to how intelligent this class really is?

INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE

A questionnaire has been devised to test student opinions on the relationship of intelligence, morality, altruism, and laziness to social class. While the respondent reads introductory material and fills out a questionnaire, the interviewer stands by to answer any question the respondent might have. A sample questionnaire reads as follows:

Name: John Doe

Major field: Law

This survey investigates the evaluation of social class by graduate students. "Social class" is not precisely definable, even though there is an awareness of different social classes in our society. As you answer the questionnaire, regard each social class with the following characteristics: (Only the most important characteristics are presented)

Upper upper class: Very wealthy; Top executives; Prominent political leaders. Wealth in the family for several generations.

Lower upper class: Very wealthy; Top executives; Prominent political leaders. Newly acquired wealth.

Upper middle class: Professional workers (lawyers, professors, doctors, etc.) Lesser executives; Engineers, Clergymen.

Lower middle class: Clerical workers; Skilled laborers.

Upper lower class: Semi-skilled laborers. Do not live in the slums.

Lower lower class: Unskilled laborers; Itinerate workers. Live in the slums.

In answering the following, consider each line as a continuum—For example, suppose you think two classes are both highly intelligent, but that one class is more intelligent than the other, then you would put your "x" for the more intelligent class further to the left than for the less intelligent class, although both x's would go in the "High" box. For the question on laziness, note the "reverse meaning" of a "High" answer and a "Low" answer.

INTELLIGENCE			
	High	Medium	Low
Upper upper class		x	
Lower upper class	x		
Upper middle class		x	
Lower middle class			x
Upper lower class			x
Lower lower class			x

(Morality, altruism, and laziness have the same type scale as that above.)

Father's occupation: Plant manager.

What do you wish to achieve as a life-time goal? To be a judge.

PRESURVEY

Four students were interviewed during which time, this interviewer learned the best method of presentation. The idea of interviewing divinity students was motivated by the fact that two of the four preliminary respondents were divinity students who did not believe that people should be classified according to social class. (None of the preliminary respondents are included in the survey.) Law students were selected because they seem to have many opportunities to go into business, politics, and related fields. These occupational opportunities may boost them out of the upper middle class into the lower upper class. In contrast, divinity students seem to have the least opportunities of advancement into the next higher social class.

HYPOTHESES

Divinity students, who are not striving to advance into the lower upper class, will rate social classes more equally than will law students who recognize a possibility of personal social advancement.

Although the call of God, the desire to do good, and other factors

are of greater importance in an individual's choice for the ministry, another factor may be either an indifferent attitude about social class or a strong concern against the idea of social classification. For example, a person may select law over the ministry if he is concerned about his social status, and wishes to advance to the lower upper class, but if his ideas are more egalitarian, motives other than personal advancement will play a more important role in the student's selection of an occupation.

Law students will favor the lower upper class on intelligence, and also rate them the least lazy of any group. This would follow if law students put an emphasis on personal advancement. Divinity students, on the other hand, would not associate effort and ability as much with social advancement because they themselves do not intend to use their abilities to this end. It follows that the more ambitious law students would rate the lower upper class higher in intelligence and lower in laziness than their less socially ambitious associates.

Finally, people whose fathers are in lower classes will be more egalitarian minded because they do not wish to believe their class inferior to the other classes. On the other hand, graduate students, if they now belong to one of the lower classes, will rise on the social ladder later in life, and will therefore rate their present class just as poorly as their fellow students.

METHOD OF TABULATION

Sixty students of the Duke University law school and divinity school are represented in the tabulations. (Thirty students from each school.) Of the thirty-three divinity students actually interviewed, two were eliminated because they represented a presurvey, and one was eliminated because he was a foreign student.

The answers on the questionnaire are rated as follows: Each "x" on a student's questionnaire represents the evaluation of one social class for one characteristic. A number, one through 6, is assigned to each x on a given student's questionnaire. Thus, if an x was assigned the number "3", this would signify that a particular social class rated third highest in comparison with the other social classes for the characteristic under consideration. Referring to the sample questionnaire, the upper middle class is assigned a "3" in intelligence, the upper upper class and the lower upper class having higher ratings in the student's opinion.

In the event of a tie, the rank is averaged. Thus, if there is a tie for first place, the number assigned to both x's would be "1½". If there is a triple tie for first place, all three x's would receive a "2" ranking. Laziness is an exception to the general rule. The highest rating is

assigned the number "6" and the lowest rating, the number "1". Finally, a letter "H", "M", or "L" is placed beside each number depending in what section the x is placed. Thus if an x is placed in the "High" section and is also rated second to another x farther to the left, the former x receives a "2H" rating.

RESULTS

EGALITARIAN TENDENCIES

Strong evidence supports the theory that divinity students are more egalitarian in their opinions on social class than are law students. Several tests indicate differences: Ability to answer—All law students answered all the questions with the exception of one student who felt that there was no correlation between social class and altruism. In contrast, five divinity students did not answer on intelligence, five did not answer on morality, three on altruism, and three on laziness. This excludes the two divinity students of the presurvey who felt that they could not answer any of the questions, and the divinity student from a foreign country who could not correlate intelligence. Why were these divinity students unable to correlate the several characteristics with social class? Three students wrote their reasons on back of their questionnaires and a fourth gave the interviewer oral answers. Of these students, one proposes a test to investigate these characteristics. The interviewer, however, explained to him that he was only interested in comparing opinions of different students and not whether they were true or false. In spite of this explanation, the respondent did not have any opinions on how to rate the classes. His first statement that "By all standards of measurement you cannot classify people into types" seems to be most indicative of his attitude. One interviewee, who probably has opinions along the same line, also believes that individuals should not be classified. This person, who would write nothing, seemed angry with the whole idea of this survey. Another respondent, the most calm of those who did not answer, criticizes the test on its vagueness. The interviewer conceded that his reasons are sufficient for declining to answer morality, altruism, and laziness, but told the respondent that he might try to do intelligence, and consider it to be based on possible I.Q. scores. However, the respondent writes, "In these categories I feel that these classes do not necessarily need to relate to intelligence." Finally, a fourth person, who merely declined to answer "Intelligence", is an environmentalist who concludes, "This then is a judgment of cultivated abilities and not natural abilities."

The following chart measures the difference in egalitarianism be-

tween law and divinity students. Five types of answers are tabulated. In the first column, "4 Same", or actually its abbreviation "4S", means that four of the six classes are rated exactly the same—a four way tie. In the second column, "Lower 3 Same" shows the number of cases where the three lowest classes are rated the same. "6 Same Area" signifies that all six x's are placed in the box—for example, all medium, all low, or all high. If the answers lie in a space between two areas, then they are arbitrarily judged to go into the "6 Same Area" column, if the range between the highest and lowest x is one inch or less. The scale used on the questionnaire is not an absolute scale, so that one person may squeeze his x's into less space than another person without indicating a more equal rating between the classes. However, when all x's are so close that the range of the x's is less than an inch, it seems to express some degree of equality. "5 Same" means a five way tie, and "6 Same" means that there is either no correlation or that the respondent has not answered the question.

LAW					DIVINITY				
4S	LS3	6SA	5S	6S	4S	LS3	6SA	5S	6S
	1					2			5
1			1		1				5
2	1		1	1	1		2	1	3
1		1					3		3

Key: 4S=4 Same, LS3=Lower 3 Same, 6SA=6 Same Area, 5S=5 Same, 6S=6 Same.

In "Altruism, Divinity", one 6SA answer also fits in the LS3 column, while the 5S answer fits the 6SA column. Under "Laziness, Divinity," one 6SA answer also fits the 4S column. These "double possibilities" are counted as a single possibility in the table.

Another test for egalitarianism is presented below. It specifies the total number of x's in the high, medium, and low areas. This test is only partially useful, because optimism and pessimism also determine the answers. For example, an optimistic individual might give "high" ratings for all six classes, but show little distinction in the way of range between the lowest and highest x. Such an answer would add six "high's" to the table without indicating the equality of these answers. Fortunately, this type of result would show up in the previously

LAW			DIVINITY		
High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
77	64	37	65	63	23
62	79	33	44	73	28
71	76	23	49	80	30
Low		High	Low		High
79	61	37	66	67	26

presented table. Divinity students have the greater proportion of "medium" ratings in all four cases presented below. Answers that give all six classes equal ratings are excluded from the tabulations.

It is interesting to note that law students are more optimistic than divinity students in regard to the morality and altruism of the social classes!

It can be argued that factors other than field of study may be the real determinants of egalitarianism. For example, most divinity students could be upper lower class members while the majority of law students might be upper middle. It might then be the case that upper lower students are more egalitarian than upper middle class students irrespective of major field. Such "other factors" have been controlled as much as possible by the question concerning father's occupation and the one on personal ambitions. The question of occupation shall be dealt with first.

Only four divinity students seem to belong to the upper lower class. Of these students, one cannot answer any of the questionnaire, and one cannot answer intelligence. If these four persons were eliminated from the survey, there would still be a marked difference in egalitarianism between law and divinity students. Of the nine divinity students who are possibly lower middle class, only two do not correlate morality—not a significant loss if these too were eliminated from the tabulations. In law, there are two possible but doubtful upper lower members and three possible lower middles, but their ideas are no more egalitarian than those of the other law students.

Personal ambition does not enter as a significant factor determining egalitarianism. Not a single divinity student manifested a desire for personal fame or prestige. In fact, only eight law students wrote goals that seemed to the interviewer to be particularly ambitious. Another little discovery, unrelated to anything else in this survey is the fact that thirteen law students did not wish to add their names to their questionnaires as opposed to only four divinity students who did not submit their names.

A summary table of results will help in the further analysis of this survey. The section "Method of Tabulation" explains how the answers of each respondent are rated. From these answers, a median rating for each social class together with an approximate range of ratings was extracted. This range may exclude one, or at the most two, x's on the extreme ends. Suppose for example, that all but two x's are placed in the 1—3 range, and the other two are rated 4 and 6 respectively. These uncommon answers would then be respected by assigning a range of 1—3½.

INTELLIGENCE RATINGS

CLASS	LAW		DIVINITY	
	Median	Range	Median	Range
Upper Upper	2½-3	1-3½	2½	1-3½
Lower Upper	1½	1-2½	1½-2	1-2½
Upper Middle	2	1-3½	2	1-3½
Lower Middle	4	3½-5½	4	3-5
Upper Lower	5	3½-5	5	4-5
Lower Lower	6	6	6	5-6

Regarding the lower classes first, divinity students rate the lower middle and upper lower classes very slightly lower than the law students. However, these lower ratings are the result of significantly higher ratings for the lower lower class on the part of divinity students. Thus, in order for the lower lower class to receive 4½, 5, 5½ and 5½ ratings from a given group of divinity students, these same students had to give lower ratings than they otherwise would to the lower middle and upper lower classes. In regard to the upper classes, both law and divinity students rate the upper lower class highest in intelligence, but the law students give the highest ratings. There is thus a slight pressing together of the extremes on the part of divinity students that indicates a more egalitarian outlook than for law students.

There is a remarkable agreement among all students in rating each class. For example, the lower classes received large clusterings around four, five and six—"four" for the lower middle class, "five" for the upper lower class, and a particularly strong "six" for the lower lower class. The lower upper class was clearly regarded as the most intelligent class followed by the upper middle class and the upper upper class. The small ranges of the answers also indicate a great deal of rating agreement among the students.

MORALITY RATINGS

CLASS	LAW		DIVINITY	
	Median	Range	Median	Range
Upper Upper	3	1-5	4	2-5½
Lower Upper	2½-3	1-4	3½-4	2-5
Upper Middle	2	1-4	2	1-4
Lower Middle	3	1-4½	2	1-3½
Upper Lower	4½-5	3-5	4-4½	1-5½
Lower Lower	6	4½-6	6	5-6

For this category, students show little agreement in rating the classes, as manifest by the large range of answers. The one exception is the lower lower class which has almost universal approval as the

ALTRUISM RATINGS

CLASS		LAW		DIVINITY	
		Median	Range	Median	Range
Upper	Upper	3	1 -6	4½-5	1 -6
Lower	Upper	3½	1 -6	4	1½-6
Upper	Middle	2½	1 -4	2½	1 -4
Lower	Middle	3 -3½	1 -5½	2 -2½	1 -4½
Upper	Lower	4	1 -5	3	1½-5
Lower	Lower	5½-6	1½-6	5	1½-6

LAZINESS RATINGS

CLASS		LAW		DIVINITY	
		Median	Range	Median	Range
Upper	Upper	3	1½-5½	3½	1 -6
Lower	Upper	1½-2	1 -3	2 -2½	1 -4
Upper	Middle	2	1 -4½	2	1 -4½
Lower	Middle	4	2 -5	3½	1½-6
Upper	Lower	4½-5	3½-5½	4½-5	2 -5
Lower	Lower	6	5½-6	6	2 -6

least moral class. The next category, altruism, shows the least agreement among the students for the appropriate ratings for each class.

For all characteristics save morality, in which case approximately equal ratings are given, divinity students rate the lower lower class higher than law students. This and other minor differences between law and divinity students may be observed, but these differences are not significant enough to merit attention.

AMBITION

The hypothesis that ambitious students give highest ratings to the lower upper class in intelligence and lack of laziness is not supported by evidence. Law students, who should represent social class ambition as opposed to divinity students, rate the lower upper class highest in intelligence and lack of laziness, but divinity students do the same for intelligence, and give a second place to lower uppers in lack of laziness.

Only eight law students seem particularly ambitious from their answers on the questionnaire as to what goals they finally wish to achieve. Executive level in business, congressman and judgeship are three typical answers. These eight "ambitious" students rate the lower upper class very slightly below the median of either law or divinity students, contrary to what should be expected if the hypothesis were true. The eight ambitious students rate the intelligence of the lower upper class as follows: Four "2H", one "1½H", and three "1H". For lack of laziness, one "3L", and "2M", four "2L" and one "1L". (The reader will remember that the letters L, M, and H refer to the "Low", "Medium", and "High" boxes on the questionnaire.)

FAVORITISM FOR ONE'S OWN CLASS

Another hypothesis that fails to find support is that lower middle class and upper lower class students will rate their particular classes higher than law or divinity students as a whole. Of the law students, three were judged as possibly lower middle, and two as possibly upper lower class. In divinity, the four upper lower class students cannot be used because of the lack of answers, but the nine possible lower middle students can be included. The two upper lower law students gave their own class on intelligence, 5L and 5M, on morality, 4½M, 4M altruism, 1½H, 4M and laziness 5M and 5H. No answers are significant—nor can this author be certain of upper lower class standing. For example, one father's occupation is marked "construction". It could mean construction worker or construction engineer. The lower middle class (three law students, nine divinity students) rates their own class as follows:

LOWER MIDDLE CLASS RATINGS

Characteristic	Law	Lower	Middle	Class
Intelligence	3M	4M	4M	
Morality	1H	2½M	3½M	
Altruism	1H	4M	5M	
Laziness	2L	4M	4M	

		Divinity		Lower		Middle		Class	
Divinity		Lower		Middle		Class			
2H	3½M	4M	4M	4M	4M	4L	4½M	5½M	
1H	1½H	2½M	3M	3½M	5M				
1H	1½M	2H	2H	2M	2M	3H	3M	3M	
2L	2L	3M	3L	3L	4M	4M	6H		

Judging class by occupation is not wholly accurate. However, even if it were, the median ratings above fluctuate slightly from the median for the groups as a whole—and in either direction. Absolutely no tendency is manifest for lower middle class students to rate themselves higher than the group of students as a whole.

CONCLUDING REMARK

The questionnaire was designed to test differences between divinity and law students. The only truly significant difference is the greater degree of egalitarian ratings and egalitarian opinions of divinity students. Law students are almost wholly lacking in egalitarian ideology.

REMEDIAL READING WITHIN A SMALL GROUP SETTING¹

Henry W. Maier

All of us who realize the importance of a small group tend, as a Southern quip puts it, to appear "as proud as a hen setting on a white football." Not much different from the hen, we too have something big and important. But it depends upon the use we make of this group, otherwise like the hen we shall wait forever for the brood to hatch. Our observations in this article will be limited to questions inherent in working with groups, such as remedial reading classes. All considerations pertaining to remedial reading itself will be left to the teacher's special knowledge and experience in that area.

To facilitate our discussion, it might be appropriate to introduce a helpful definition from social group work, the distinction between *task* and *growth-oriented* groups. A *task-oriented* group is organized (or just "happens" to exist) for the purpose of accomplishing a range of pre-determined tasks. A *growth-oriented* group refers to the small group which primarily develops (or "happens" to exist) for the purpose of supporting or correcting the psycho-social adjustment of its members through this very group experience itself.² Although the *growth-oriented* group also tends to concentrate upon the tasks at hand, it is in itself the reason for gatherings. The friendship club, the neighborhood group, or therapy group can be listed under this latter category. Conversely, while the task-oriented group also adds in varying degrees to the adjustment and growth of its members, the members and enabler (the leader, teacher or advisor) have come together as a group primarily in order to accomplish previously established tasks.

Remedial reading groups are *task-oriented*. With the aid of such a classification, therefore, we can establish the following premises:

1. group membership is related to the tasks at hand;
2. concerns related to individual personality adjustment require attention within the context of this group only as long as they impinge *directly* on the group member's *immediate* capacity to learn to read within this group;
3. concerns related to the activities and the continuance of the group are relevant only as long as they relate to the group as a vehicle for remedial reading and not to the group as an entity in itself.

¹ Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Minnesota Reading Association, Minnetonka, Minnesota — May 9, 1959.

² Wilson, Gertrude, "Social Group Work—Trends and Development," *Social Work*, Vol. 1, No. 4, October, 1956, p. 75.

In other words, a remedial reading group is distinctly different from a therapy group, a club, or a play group even if, as we shall see later on, play activities, personal bonds, and above all, a *therapeutic* atmosphere, are employed in its operation.

This paper will deal primarily with the essential steps in working with a new remedial reading group. "What are the points a teacher wants to keep in mind in starting a small remedial reading group of four to ten pupils?" He is mindful that the pupils of such a new group will come from different grades; they may vary greatly in age, capacity and interest, and even more in the underlying difficulties leading to their reading deficiencies. Furthermore, these pupils are *singled out* and *lumped together* into one special reading group, at best within their own schools, but apart from their classmates and outside of their regular, traditional educational program.

These general observations lead to four essential questions with which the teacher has to deal from the onset:

1. What is (or has been) the orientation of the pupils and the teacher to the group prior to its formation?
 2. What is the group's level of performance in its early developmental stage?
 3. What are the immediate tasks for each particular group?
 4. How do the different group members relate to each other, to the teacher and to the group-as-a-whole, after they started to be together as a group?
1. *What is (or has been) the Orientation of the Pupils and the Teacher to the Group Prior to its Formation?*

Much of a group's future and effectiveness is shaped long before its members gather for the first time. The quality of planning for and preparation of the group's aims, and the selective arrangements of physical setting and equipment, as we know so well, are of utmost importance. And as the program receives prior consideration, so must each prospective group member. He must be oriented to this new educational experience. He must be helped to sense the group as something different from his previous school experience. He must receive a full interpretation of the temporary removal from his regular class and class-mates and of his grouping with others whom he may not even know. Such an interpretation must convey to the pupil that this arrangement is neither intended as punishment nor as blemishment. In other words, long before the actual group formation each member must first become familiarized with *the idea* of the purpose of the group, of his becoming a member of a special group, and of his being together with others who have similar difficulties. Some of this counseling can occur by frank exploration of the student's ques-

tions about this special group, by his meeting the new teacher, and, eventually, some of his prospective fellow group members.

In this period of orientation it is essential to help the pupil form a realistic image of the purpose of the new group, such as "a group for pupils with long-standing difficulties in reading who come together for an opportunity to work on these difficulties." Note—such an orientation primarily highlights three factors: (1) *being with others*, (2) *similar difficulties* and (3) *an opportunity to work together on these difficulties*. (There is no suggestion that the pupil will be with others "like him," because who wants to meet another exactly like himself anyhow?) In addition to the positive common denominators, there are other inherent common denominators which need recognition but not necessarily support. The pupils may easily find common cause in their resistance to learning, antipathies toward school, teacher or adult authorities, and so on. The orientation must establish that the group is not just another teaching situation with pressure to read. Educators wisely do not label and operate these remedial groups as classes. At the same time, however, we must remain aware that the pupils are assigned to each group without any choice, that the school situation demands they be there. The group situation, on the other hand, must eventually challenge the pupils to involve and to invest themselves as group members and learners.

To safeguard against potential resistance and to assure the pupil's early investment, it is essential that no attempt be made to sell the group, the friendship of other group members or the notion that the student will learn to read. In fact, future difficulties can be helped toward solutions by recognizing from the very beginning that the pupil most likely will encounter disappointments, difficulties, and frustrations even within this special group. Simultaneously, the teacher must find an opportunity to assure the student of his guiding and supportive help.

In short, the potential group members must be helped to gain a tentative notion that this group might be worthwhile their investment. They must feel a beginning sense of trust toward this new experiment. At least they must feel the group as "somewhat safe," or, as a ten-year-old boy once put it, "I can't smell a rat, yet."

Needless to say, the preparation of the student must be paralleled by similar interpretations to the parents, to the regular classroom teacher and, if advisable, to fellow classmates.

Each step in the orientation of the student gives the teacher equal opportunity to acquaint himself beforehand with his prospective group as individuals, and above all, with their particular reading difficulties. As we know too well, youngsters may have similar difficulties in read-

ing but the causes and circumstances of the difficulties will vary from student to student. It is important therefore, that the teacher envisage each student's problem situation as it relates to him and to the situation of the other group members. Note again—the teacher's image of the group is not that of a reading group or a learning-to-read group *per se*, because neither image can be instrumental in providing a potential bond among the students. Rather, the teacher's image of the group must be that of individuals group together for the purpose of working jointly on each one's unique reading problem, because each one could not master reading alone within the regular classroom setting.

Special attention must be called to the real possibility that a pupil might need other or additional services. If his reading problem is primarily anchored in deep emotional or other deviations it may be beyond the special group's range and outside of the teacher's responsibility to deal with with it.³

2. *What is the Group Level of Performance in its Early Developmental Stage?*

Preparation for group membership entails at least a minimum level of readiness. The actual level of individual as well as group readiness—behavioral and knowledge-wise—cannot be ascertained until the individuals involved have met as a group. From the onset the teacher must consider himself an integral part of this group. As a participant-observer he appraises the quality of involvement of each of his pupils: He wants to know through his sensitive observations and his own emphatic personal contact for whom the group is becoming a source of support, for whom it is becoming another trial situation, and for whom a renewed experience of the clash with authority.

The teacher's initial cursory impressions are re-shaped by his answers to questions such as the following: How do the pupils seek out each other? How and when do they keep aloof from each other? How does this interaction and the group atmosphere change if the teacher directs his attention to a single child or absents himself completely? What is the quality of interaction among the pupils under specifically noted circumstances? How do the group members react to success, to failure, to frustration of their own and to that of other members? Are there any differences in reaction depending upon who is involved?

Such observations become essential for the teacher in his work with individuals and in his efforts to strengthen and to foster a sense

³ Kunst, Mary S. "Learning Disabilities: Their Dynamics and Treatment," *Social Work*, Vol. IV, No. 1, January 1959, p. 95-101.

of togetherness will facilitate mutual support, identification and personal bonds among group members. Above all, the answers to these questions will define, in parts, the developmental level of the group and the essential approach to the group. In summary, the teacher must establish the level of interaction in his group before he can appraise his plan of immediate action, because he should begin to work with the group on the level at which they are functioning.

3. *What are the Immediate Tasks for Each Particular Group?*

In the immediate day-by-day work with the remedial group the teacher must shift his thinking from pre-occupation with the purpose and aims of the group to establishment of the group's actual level of operation at any particular time. For instance, a new group is most likely characterized by uncertainty among its members and by an incapacity to work effectively even in those areas where it could achieve immediate competence. A youngster's uncertainty may seek expression in many different forms such as in futile attempts to outdo another or in the holding back of a display of skills and personal feelings. In either situation, the teacher must deal with the youngster's feelings of uncertainty as well as with the youngster's form of dealing with them. The teacher's focus must be upon the child's capacity to contribute right then and there regardless of the inadequacy of his contribution. His potential capacity is of little concern to the child at this point. He needs to experience the experience of success at this moment.

Furthermore, each new group tends to test the teacher and the group's purpose, because each of the group members wants to experience for himself their ultimate meaning for him. Such a group represents a new and quite different experience for each of the pupils. Therefore, it may become advisable in the beginning to encourage an informal atmosphere with much freedom in movement and expression. This informality should support and encourage periods of play as well as group discussions of the pupils' feelings about their transfers to a special reading group. It may become advisable to introduce at that point a project of genuine interest to *all* but rather unrelated to remedial reading. In many ways this Remedial Group may appear, look, sound and even smell like a therapy group—but it is not. The teacher encourages an informal atmosphere, because at this point he wants foremost that the group members relate to each other to find a sense of cohesiveness; and that he be in a better position to study their methods of approaching facts and their means of handling failure and frustration. The teacher may permit open expression of feeling, including antagonism to this very school situation, because he wants to concentrate with the students upon the problem in order to remove

some of their resistance to the special reading class. The teacher needs to welcome free expression because it contains the "ingredients" for finding a common growth-encouraging denominator among the pupils, such as a sense of togetherness in having different difficulties within one common range of activities.

A teacher's spontaneous handling of an explosive situation with stress upon the underlying complications rather than upon the maintenance of classroom order may be illustrated by the following case excerpt:

"... Next we were going to have mathematics — I felt the kids were getting edgy. All of a sudden Willie's chair slipped from under him and on the way down he grabbed at Sandy's desk — knocking it over. Sandy flared, squared off at Willie. I separated them. Merrit knocked all his stuff on the floor again and while it lay there Zeke got up and gave him a nuggie (a sharp rap on top of the head). "Stupid—pick up the papers!" he yelled, standing over Merrit. "Okay Zeke," I yelled, "knock it off and sit down! Everybody put away your spelling—common, move—pronto!" I said loudly, walking around the room quickly. I sat on top of my desk and said, "Okay guys—let's relax. In a few more minutes we would all be killing each other. What's going on here? We were going great guns doing spelling and bang-murder breaks out." No comment. I let the silence sink in a bit. "You know what I think—I think we're scared to death of doing fractions. And though we're doing spelling—or were just before the roof fell in—you guys are making sure we're not going to get to do math by blowing up now. What's the matter with you guys—you have to blow up to tell me you don't want to tackle fractions?" Sandy said, "Jez—you know I'm never going to learn that stuff." "Yeah—my head was busting yesterday," said Harry. "You know something," said Arne, "I didn't know it but I was getting all tied up inside. When Zeke busted Merrit one I felt like busting Zeke one right in the kisser." When Merrit came up with "And I felt like busting everybody in the kisser!" we all broke up. I handed out the math assignment and it was okay.⁴

The teacher may introduce play, general discussions, even an extraneous project considerably removed from the task of remedial reading, not in order to copy a therapy session, but because in the beginning he must help the pupils find a sense of trust in each other and in him—an essential prerequisite for any sound group experience. In fact, the teacher might have snacks available. Refreshments are preferred at this point in the group's development, because the giving and receiving of food combined with the enjoyment of eating it, together tend to foster mutual acceptance of members and teacher most readily. Food is not just offered as a standard feature of therapy.

⁴From Shaw, Gilbert E. *Planned Interference: A Clinically-Oriented Method for Teaching Disturbed Children*, (Unpublished Mimeographed Paper), Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children, Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 8, 1959.

of togetherness will facilitate mutual support, identification and personal bonds among group members. Above all, the answers to these questions will define, in parts, the developmental level of the group and the essential approach to the group. In summary, the teacher must establish the level of interaction in his group before he can appraise his plan of immediate action, because he should begin to work with the group on the level at which they are functioning.

3. *What are the Immediate Tasks for Each Particular Group?*

In the immediate day-by-day work with the remedial group the teacher must shift his thinking from pre-occupation with the purpose and aims of the group to establishment of the group's actual level of operation at any particular time. For instance, a new group is most likely characterized by uncertainty among its members and by an incapacity to work effectively even in those areas where it could achieve immediate competence. A youngster's uncertainty may seek expression in many different forms such as in futile attempts to outdo another or in the holding back of a display of skills and personal feelings. In either situation, the teacher must deal with the youngster's feelings of uncertainty as well as with the youngster's form of dealing with them. The teacher's focus must be upon the child's capacity to contribute right then and there regardless of the inadequacy of his contribution. His potential capacity is of little concern to the child at this point. He needs to experience the experience of success at this moment.

Furthermore, each new group tends to test the teacher and the group's purpose, because each of the group members wants to experience for himself their ultimate meaning for him. Such a group represents a new and quite different experience for each of the pupils. Therefore, it may become advisable in the beginning to encourage an informal atmosphere with much freedom in movement and expression. This informality should support and encourage periods of play as well as group discussions of the pupils' feelings about their transfers to a special reading group. It may become advisable to introduce at that point a project of genuine interest to *all* but rather unrelated to remedial reading. In many ways this Remedial Group may appear, look, sound and even smell like a therapy group—but it is not. The teacher encourages an informal atmosphere, because at this point he wants foremost that the group members relate to each other to find a sense of cohesiveness; and that he be in a better position to study their methods of approaching facts and their means of handling failure and frustration. The teacher may permit open expression of feeling, including antagonism to this very school situation, because he wants to concentrate with the students upon the problem in order to remove

some of their resistance to the special reading class. The teacher needs to welcome free expression because it contains the "ingredients" for finding a common growth-encouraging denominator among the pupils, such as a sense of togetherness in having different difficulties within one common range of activities.

A teacher's spontaneous handling of an explosive situation with stress upon the underlying complications rather than upon the maintenance of classroom order may be illustrated by the following case excerpt:

"... Next we were going to have mathematics — I felt the kids were getting edgy. All of a sudden Willie's chair slipped from under him and on the way down he grabbed at Sandy's desk — knocking it over. Sandy flared, squared off at Willie. I separated them. Merrit knocked all his stuff on the floor again and while it lay there Zeke got up and gave him a nuggie (a sharp rap on top of the head). "Stupid—pick up the papers!" he yelled, standing over Merrit. "Okay Zeke," I yelled, "knock it off and sit down! Everybody put away your spelling—common, move—pronto!" I said loudly, walking around the room quickly. I sat on top of my desk and said, "Okay guys—let's relax. In a few more minutes we would all be killing each other. What's going on here? We were going great guns doing spelling and bang-murder breaks out." No comment. I let the silence sink in a bit. "You know what I think—I think we're scared to death of doing fractions. And though we're doing spelling—or were just before the roof fell in—you guys are making sure we're not going to get to do math by blowing up now. What's the matter with you guys—you have to blow up to tell me you don't want to tackle fractions?" Sandy said, "Jez—you know I'm never going to learn that stuff." "Yeah—my head was busting yesterday," said Harry. "You know something," said Arne, "I didn't know it but I was getting all tied up inside. When Zeke busted Merrit one I felt like busting Zeke one right in the kisser." When Merrit came up with "And I felt like busting everybody in the kisser!" we all broke up. I handed out the math assignment and it was okay.⁴

The teacher may introduce play, general discussions, even an extraneous project considerably removed from the task of remedial reading, not in order to copy a therapy session, but because in the beginning he must help the pupils find a sense of trust in each other and in him—an essential prerequisite for any sound group experience. In fact, the teacher might have snacks available. Refreshments are preferred at this point in the group's development, because the giving and receiving of food combined with the enjoyment of eating it, together tend to foster mutual acceptance of members and teacher most readily. Food is not just offered as a standard feature of therapy.

⁴ From Shaw, Gilbert E. *Planned Interference: A Clinically-Oriented Method for Teaching Disturbed Children*, (Unpublished Mimeographed Paper), Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children, Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 8, 1959.

In summary, working with a small group as a group requires an assessment of the group's ongoing level of behavior and interests, its essential level of readiness for being in a learning situation, and of working within this very immediate level. Only then can the group of pupils sense the teacher's desire to be of genuine help to them with their *ongoing* difficulties, rather than appearing to be an advocate of new tasks (such as the capacity to read) which seem to them, at this point, to be unsurmountable. Simultaneously, the teacher himself must utilize every available opportunity to convey to his pupils the sense of joint responsibility for an atmosphere of mutual respect and give-and-take, and the willingness to face their difficulties squarely.

4. *How do the Different Group Members Relate to Each Other, to the Teacher and to the Group as a whole, after They Started to be Together as a Group?*

As the teacher and his group of pupils begin *to be together* on what ever level he finds, then he slowly develops with his group the desired values and overall atmosphere. In his work with his pupils *as a group of pupils*, the teacher must assess the relationship among the group members, including himself. It will be important to locate the key pupils in the group, as well as to evaluate *the circumstances* which lead these particular pupils to assume the central position and which encourages others to depend upon them. Understanding the quality of interpersonal relationships and the roles each group member assumes, will suggest to the teacher which aspects of these interpersonal relationships he wants to support and to build upon, and which require readjustment. To illustrate: a domineering group member most likely *needs recognition as an individual independent of his domination of others*. On the other hand, *the followers* of either central person demand cognition of their dependency upon others as well as encouragement to speak and to act for themselves whenever they differ. Positive cohesiveness depends upon the members finding mutual security among each other rather than mere dependency.

The Remedial Group provides the pupil with a shift from a large to an *intimate* group situation, where he can neither get lost nor be surrounded by questioning on-lookers. He is faced with the potentials for forming real relationships. He finds himself with others who may be as much interested in what happens to him as he is in the others' classroom experience. The teacher's comments, personal reactions, or spatial movements and position in relation to one pupil, carry real significance and are most likely observed by all. There is much potential for identification and mutual supplementation. Consequently, any *individual* tutoring, praising, questioning or limit-setting, more likely than not, involves the necessity of dealing with all! For instance, the

teacher's response to Susan's refusal to tackle a difficult paragraph, or to John's volunteering to be the first reader, are watched and experienced by a deeply involved audience.

The teacher must discern each pupil's relationship to himself, to his fellow group-mates and to the group-as-a-whole, because any undue emphasis upon one factor occurs at the expense of another. He must evaluate his own role and must constantly appraise to what extent he can afford to foster an individual pupil's dependency upon him at a time when he wants to stress the supportive potentials of the whole group.

In summation of this fourth question it can be stated, once the group members are brought together with their teacher as a group, they, pupils, and teacher, produce important group phenomena. These group phenomena such as group status, individual denomination or submission, differential relationships, identification with others, group bonds, etc., must be appraised and the findings must be incorporated into purposeful remedial effort.

This paper stressed that a Remedial Reading Group might be considered as a *group* of pupils brought together for a common range of tasks in which each individual has the potential capacity to support the other and to succeed on his own through a sense of mutuality and togetherness.

Every group's potential success depends upon the initial preparations in orienting such a group and in discerning the pupil's conception of the group. Much of the teacher's initial effort must be directed toward establishing with the pupils a group atmosphere, in which each student dares to try and dares to fail in front of the others. Much of this group atmosphere depends upon the teacher's creative efforts in helping the pupils to establish comfortably a common cause over and above the real purpose of remedial reading.

Henry W. Maier is Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle Washington.

BOOK REVIEWS

Albee, George W., Ph.D. *Mental Health Manpower Trends*, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 159.

This vital report, the third in the series to be published by the Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness, written by Dr. George W. Albee of Western Reserve University, points up the enormous problem faced by our nation in reassessing our services to the mentally ill and in the education of students in the mental health field. The survey portrays a picture of several fields of endeavor toward mental health; namely, the areas of psychiatry, medicine, psychology, social work, psychiatric nursing and other related professions.

The results of this study indicate the need for the training of more personnel. As an intermediate step he suggests the relocation of personnel to achieve a better balance between supply and demand in rural areas and urban centers and to devise methods of treatment which are capable of reaching larger numbers of patients by utilizing less highly trained professionals.

The author foresees greater shortage unless encouragement and interest are created in college students to enter the mental health field. Our lawmakers should become more aware of the financial needs of young students entering this field. The most valuable suggestion in this report is the need for a concerted prospective view of basic research in etiology and pathology rather than the present approach in evaluating or improving skills and techniques.

How woefully inadequate is our acceptance of our obligations in this field is Dr. Albee's constant plea. He cites the one milion patients who are treated yearly in mental hospitals and the moneys spent on mental health research as only about twenty milion dollars. He concludes with this statement, "Barring the possibility of a massive national effort would imply, or the possibility of a sharp breakthrough in mental health reseach, the prospects are pessimistic for significant improvements in the quantity or quality of professional services in these fields.'

FRANCES G. KOENIG, Ph.D.

Asst. Prof.—Graduate School
Southern Connecticut State College,
New Haven, Conn.

Visiting Faculty-Graduate School
Yeshiva University, New York City

Burton W. Kreitlow, E. W. Aiton, Andrew P. Torrence, *Leadership For Action In Rural Communities*. The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

Leadership For Action In Rural Communities is designed to improve the leadership ability of community leaders. Although the authors focus their attention on leaders of rural communities, much of the material is applicable and helpful to all who have the opportunity to serve as leaders. Leaders apply skills that work in many situations, however, there is always that time when the feeling of inadequacy arises. This is a book that "talks shop" as it helps the reader to develop and improve his leadership skills.

The book is divided into four sections. The first section emphasizes the importance of leadership in organizations and the responsibility of leaders in the community. The next section presents and identifies basic principles of democratic leadership and discusses the role of the leader in group situations. The third section consists of nine carefully selected case studies which describe and analyze leadership programs. The book concludes with an evaluation of today and forecasts what leadership of tomorrow should be.

The authors very effectively demonstrate that the knowledge of the principles of leadership provide sound basis for making decisions, and determining techniques and methods that should be used in each situation. With these principles in mind to guide his actions, the leader does not have to be a human reservoir of techniques and methods of leadership.

Practical and meaningful guides on how to plan a meeting, presiding over a meeting, promoting attendance at a meeting, securing new members, and many other similar situations that must be skillfully met by the leader are discussed. The authors abiding faith in the democratic process and belief that democratic leadership is the most efficient means of promoting the best interests of individuals, groups, and society are emphatically and thoroughly supported by the chapter that presents a comparison of the authoritative and democratic type of leaders.

Leadership For Action In Rural Communities is not only an interesting book to read, but is also the kind of book one finds himself referring to frequently as a source for practical suggestions and ideas. Every leader and potential leader who reads this book will surely want to place one in his personal library.

FRANK FUSCO, Principal
Gardiners Avenue
Elementary School
Levittown, L.I., New York

Planning Your School Building Dollar. By Carl H. Stautz. Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1960. \$2.75

When Soames Forsyte, one of the leading characters in Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga*, had a Victorian house built, the transaction cost him \$20,000 more than he expected. He also became embroiled in a law suit and his wife transferred her affections to the architect. School board members do not usually become involved in as many personal complications when they plan school buildings, but occasionally they find their ultimate costs have exceeded their original expectations. The purpose of this book is to help them prepare estimates that will reasonably approximate the final cost.

One may safely surmise that a goodly portion of the citizens who accepted the office of school board member so gladly had little inkling of what lay in store for them. Mr. Stautz, a school architect and specialist in school design and construction, describes their experiences in one area—acquiring a new school plant. He explains each step in detail, warns of pitfalls, and offers specific advice on how to handle each situation.

This little volume does offer suggestions on how to get the most and the best in school plant for the least outlay, but his primary audience will be school board members rather than architects or building contractors. They will need to know how to project the size of the future school population, how to select the right architect and to evaluate his plans, how to arrange proper financing, and how to maintain good community relations at each stage of the process.

This is not a book for the general public. But for laymen who are called on to supervise school building programs (particularly in suburban school districts, where a project of this kind sometimes generates a great deal of heat) this volume could prove an invaluable guide.

FREDERICK SHAW
Research Associate

el-

is-
on
ed
ct.
ny
n-
ec-
es

ho
ng
nd
ces
in
dle

ost
di-
ng
the
lu-
ain

are
ur-
tes